

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 are all the claims pending in the application.

**I. Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-19 are all pending in the application.

Claims 11 has been objected to based on an informality. Claims 4, 6-9, 12, and 14-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite.

Claims 1, 2, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,826,690 to Hind *et al.* (“Hind”). Claims 3-7, 10-15, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hind, in further view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0048744 to Kimura.

Claims 8, 9, 16, and 17 are indicated as containing allowable matter and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form.

**II. Claim Objections**

Applicant submits that claim 11 does not contain informalities therein.

**III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Applicant submits that claims 4, 6-9, 12, and 14-19 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

**IV. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 2, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Hind.

Applicant amends claim 1 with some of the claim elements of allowable claim 8, as shown above, for further clarity.

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable because Hind does not disclose the gateway comprising a selection unit for selecting a display for the authentication result based on the

device information on the device that is previously stored, in combination with other elements of the claim.

With respect to claims 2 and 18, they are dependent on amended claim 1. Therefore, they are patentable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

**V. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3-7, 10-15, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hind, in further view of Kimura. With respect to claims 3-7, they are dependent on claim 1. Therefore, they are patentable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

Applicant amends claim 10 to include certain elements of allowable claim 16, as shown above, for further clarity. Applicant submits that claim 10 is patentable because Hind and Kimura fail disclose or suggest selecting a display for the authentication result based on device information of a device connected to a network, in combination with other elements of the claim.

With respect to claims 11-15 and 19, they are dependent on amended claim 10. Therefore, they are patentable at least for their dependency on amended claim 10.

**VI. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ S. Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

S. Stuart Lee  
Registration No. 61,124

Date: January 3, 2008